

- (b) *benoit* Rüppell, 1852, as published in the binomen *Pharopteryx benoit*, with the endorsement that this name is not to be used in preference to *kleinenbergi* Giglioli, 1889 by any zoologist who considers that the two names refer to the same species-group taxon.

COMMENTS AND ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL ON THE CONSERVATION
OF *STRIGLINA* GUÉNÉE, 1877. Z.N.(S.) 2025
(See volume 30, pages 61–62)

By P. E. S. Whalley (*British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*)

Dr. I. W. B. Nye has shown me his comments (1974, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 30 : 140–141) on the above case. The object of my application as summarized in the title is to conserve the generic name *Striglina* Guénée, 1877. Whether it is preferable to do this by placing *Striglina* on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, thereby giving it precedence now and in the future over all other names for this taxon; or whether it is preferable to place its unused senior subjective synonym *Daristane* Walker, 1859, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, is an important technicality on which the Commission should provide guidance for this and similar cases.

In addition, my original proposals were incomplete since they did not provide for the placing of *Striglina* on the Official List. They should therefore be completed by adding:

(3) to place the generic name *Striglina* Guénée, 1877 (gender: feminine), type-species, by subsequent designation by Whalley, 1964, *Striglina lineola* Guénée, 1877, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(4) place the specific name *scitaria* Walker, 1862,¹ as published in the binomen *Drepanodes scitaria*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

Pending the resolution by the Commission of the general point mentioned above, I therefore now put forward two alternative proposals: either (A) my original proposals as expanded herein; or (B):

(1) to rule under the plenary powers that the generic name *Striglina* Guénée, 1877, is to be given precedence over the generic name *Daristane* Walker, 1859, by any zoologist who considers those names to apply to a single genus;

(2), (3), consequential Official List action for *Striglina* and its type-species, as under (A); repeating the endorsement under (1);

(4) to place the generic name *Daristane* Walker, 1859 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Daristane tibiaria* Walker, 1859, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with an endorsement that it is not to be used to displace *Striglina* Guénée, 1877;

(5) to place the specific name *tibiaria* Walker, 1859, as published in the binomen *Daristane tibiaria*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

COMMENTS ON AND ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL FOR THE
PROPOSAL (Z.N.(S.) 2036) TO CONSERVE *HYDROPHORUS* FALLÉN
AND TO SUPPRESS THE DESIGNATION BY MACQUART OF
HYDROPHORUS JACULUS FALLÉN AS TYPE SPECIES

By John A. Hendrickson, Jr. and Selwyn S. Roback (*Department of Linnology,
Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Pa., 19103, U.S.A.*)

INTRODUCTION

We agree with Steyskal, *et al.* (1973) that it is in the interest of taxonomic clarity

¹ Walker, F., 1862, List of specimens of lepidopterous Insects in the collection of the British Museum, vol. 26, p. 1488.

and continuity to suppress all previous designations of a type species for *Hydrophorus* Fallén and to conserve *Hydrophorus* Fallén with one of the 2nd, 3rd, or 4th of the originally included species as the type species. We disagree with that proposal in doubting the applicability of Article 70(a) of the Code and in following an earlier suggestion that *Hydrophorus binotatus* Fallén, 1823 be designated as the type species. We present further evidence which clarifies the history of the applications of the name *Hydrophorus* Fallén. Finally, we present an alternative request for action by the Commission, including application for action under the plenary powers alone.

IDENTITY OF THE TYPE SPECIES

Meigen (1824) was the first compiler and reviser to use the work of Fischer (1819), Lehmann (1822) and Fallén (1823). Macquart (1827) could have (on the basis of included species, spellings, descriptions, and bibliographic citations) worked solely from Meigen (1824) with no reference to work by Fischer, Lehmann and Fallén.

Meigen (1824) did not indicate by name a type species for *Medeterus* Fischer, (for ease in citing historic usage, we use the spelling provided by Meigen, rather than *Medetera*, which is the correct name) nor did he indicate that Fischer's genus was monotypic, nor did he provide Fischer's specific name for the species Fischer described and illustrated. Meigen listed *M. regius* (Fabr.) [*Musca*] (with a dorsal arista) first in his treatment of *Medeterus* and provided two illustrations of that species (of six illustrations for the genus). (Two other illustrations are of antennae of unnamed species, and both have the arista distinctly dorsal. A fifth illustration is of *M. notatus* (Fabr.) [*Musca*], which also has the arista dorsal. The remaining illustration of a frontal view of the head of an unnamed species is consistent with modern species having the arista dorsal). Macquart (1827) placed 12 species from Meigen (1824) in the genera *Hydrophorus* and *Medeterus*; of these, 9 have the arista dorsal. Finally, Macquart (1827 and 1834) listed *H. jaculus* first in *Hydrophorus* and *M. regius* first in *Medeterus*.

Thus Macquart's separation of *Hydrophorus* (with arista apical) based on *Hydrophorus jaculus* Fallén was reasonable if he assumed (as seems likely) that *Medeterus regius* (Fabr.) was the type species of *Medeterus* Fischer. Two additional lines of evidence (a and b) corroborate this view.

(a) Macquart (1827) assigned 4 species to *Hydrophorus*, three of which clearly have the arista apical (see below under designation of a new type species), and he assigned 16 species to *Medeterus*, 15 of which have the arista dorsal. There are no citations of specimens determined by Macquart (1827) as *H. jaculus* which have subsequently been listed in the synonymies of species with the arista dorsal (*vide* Kertész, 1909, Lundbeck, 1912, Parent, 1938).

(b) Macquart (1834) continued to use the same states of the same character to separate the genera *Hydrophorus* and *Medeterus*. Meigen (1838) noted the variation of arista placement, but regarded *Hydrophorus* as a weak segregate of *Medeterus*. Zetterstedt (1840, *et seq.*) treated *Medeterus* as a subgenus of *Hydrophorus*, although (1843 : 448, footnote 1) he bemoans the fact that if the latter genus were split, the name *Hydrophorus* would go to wholly terrestrial species, while it would be an apt name for the species frequenting water (the "modern" concept).

The foregoing strongly suggest that Macquart did not misidentify the material he regarded as belonging to *Hydrophorus jaculus*. Therefore, application of Article 70(a) is inappropriate.

ORIGIN AND STABILITY OF THE "MODERN CONCEPT" OF *HYDROPHORUS*

The next 15 years of literature (1844–1858) show various uses of the two generic names, *Hydrophorus* and *Medeterus*. Wahlberg (1844) is given credit (Haliday, 1851, Steyskal, *et al.*, 1973) for the first use of *Hydrophorus* in the modern concept; however his descriptions of two new species (one in *Hydrophorus*, one in *Medeterus*) make no mention of the placement of the arista. Haliday (1851) cites Wahlberg (1844) as the source of his concept of *Hydrophorus* as having the arista dorsal. Loew

(1857) follows (Haliday (1851) in) Walker as the source of his concept of *Hydrophorus*, from which he segregates two new genera. Loew seems to have recognized (1857) that *Medeterus* Fischer had been monotypic. Walker (1858), following either Macquart, Meigen, Zetterstedt, or Walker (1849) described two new species, (now in the HYDROPHORINAE) with dorsal aristas in *Medeterus*. Perris (1849 or 1850) segregated a new genus, *Aphrozeta*, with two included species, both new, from *Medeterus* (*sensu* Macquart and Meigen), and the arista is dorsal in this genus.

In general, Loew (1857) has been followed by most subsequent entomological authors. We offer three brief quotes to suggest the tenacity of modern dipterists in applying Loew's concept of *Hydrophorus*.

Aldrich (1911) notes, "The genus *Hydrophorus*, established by Fallén in 1823, as limited by Loew in 1857, as generally used since and as herein understood, comprises those flies . . .".

Collin (1940 : 268) says of *Hydrophorus* Fln., "This well-known name is in danger of suppression One cannot under these circumstances too strongly urge that the Zoological Commission be requested to place *Hydrophorus* Fln. with type *H. binotatus* Fln. (= *bipunctatus* Lehm.) on the reserved list of generic names".

Cole (1969 : 279) states, "... Coquillett . . . stated *Hydrophorus* of authors equals *Aphrozeta* Perris (1850). We do not accept this interpretation but follow Aldrich, Becker, and others".

Further, the most commonly used key for the identification of immature aquatic stages of dipterans (Johannsen, 1935) provides the determination "*Hydrophorus agalma*" in one of the few couplets within the DOLICHOPODIDAE. Perhaps not all specimens determined as such are indeed in *Hydrophorus*, but the name is in general use by aquatic entomologists.

DESIGNATION OF A NEW TYPE SPECIES

If the plenary powers are applied to suppress Macquart's designation of *Hydrophorus jaculus* Fallén, 1823 as the type species of *Hydrophorus* Fallén (and all other designations prior to such a ruling), only three originally included species seem to be suitable candidates for such designation: *H. binotatus* Fallén, 1823, *H. litoreus* Fallén, 1823 and *H. nebulosus* Fallén, 1823. Steyskal, *et al.* (1973) suggest *H. nebulosus* Fallén, as being a distinctive species subject to no prior taxonomic confusion. However, at least two authors (Macquart (1837, 1834) and Neuhaus (1886)) seem to have regarded the arista as (sub ?) apical in this species. Moreover, among western European species, *H. nebulosus* seems to be aberrant in both the length of the third antennal segment and the pattern of wing spotting (Lundbeck, 1912, and Parent, 1938). Choice of an aberrant species would seem to be inconsistent with future stability of the generic name.

The name *H. litoreus* Fallén and its junior subjective synonyms have been applied at various times to several modern species. This does not conform to the recommendation of an easily recognizable type species.

Collin (1940) suggested *H. binotatus* Fallén for designation as the type species of *Hydrophorus* Fallén. This species (long regarded as a junior subjective synonym of *Hydrophorus bipunctatus* (Lehmann, 1822) [*Dolichopus*]) seems to be representative of several European species, and would thus be a suitable type species for future stability.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, in the interests of stability in nomenclature, the commission is requested:

- (1) to disallow application of Article 70(a) of the code as requested in proposal Z.N.(S.) 2036 because there is no evidence supporting the claim of a misidentified type species;
- (2) to use its plenary powers to suppress all designations of type species for *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823 made prior to the requested ruling and to designate *Hydrophorus binotatus* Fallén, 1823 as the type species of the said genus;
- (3) to place the generic name *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823 (gender masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (2) above, *Hydrophorus binotatus* Fallén, 1823 on the Official List of Generic Names on Zoology;

- (4) to place the specific name *bipunctatus* Lehmann, 1822 as published in the binomen *Dolichopus bipunctatus* on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
- (5) to place the subfamily name* HYDROPHORINAE Lioy, 1864 on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

- ALDRICH, J. M. 1911. A revision of the North American species of the dipterous genus *Hydrophorus*. *Psyche* 18 : 45-70, 1 pl.
- COLE, F. R. 1969. *The flies of Western North America*. xii+693 pp., Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley
- COLLIN, J. E. 1940. Critical notes on some recent synonymy affecting British species of Dolichopodidae (Diptera). *Entomol. Mon. Mag.* 76 : 261-271
- FALLÉN, C. F. 1823. *Monographia Dolichopodum Sveciae*. 22 pp., Lundae.
- FISCHER [DE WALDHEIM], G. 1819. Notice sur une mouche carnivore, nommé Mèdètère. *Progr. Soc. imp. Natural* (Moscou) 15 Dec. 1819 : 5-11, 1 pl.
- HALIDAY, A. H. 1851. Family XXI. *Dolichopidae*. In Walker, F., et al., *Insecta Britannica*. Vol. 1 (= Diptera, Vol. 1): 144-221. London
- JOHANNSEN, O. A. 1935. Aquatic Diptera. Part II. Orthorrhapha-Brachycera and Cyclorrhapha. *N.Y. (Cornell) Agr. Expt. Sta. Mem.* 164 : 1-71, 24 pls.
- KERTESZ, C. 1909. *Catalogus dipterorum hucusque descriptorum*. VI. Empididae, Dolichopodidae, Muscivoridae. 362 pp., Budapestini
- LEHMANN, J. G. C. 1822. *Observationes zoologicae praesertim in faunam Hamburgensem*. Pugillus primus. 53 pp., Hamburgi
- LOEW, N. 1857. Neue Beiträge Zur Kenntniss der Dipteren. *5ter Beitrag. Progr. Mereritz*: 1-56
- LUNDBECK, W. 1912. *Diptera Danica*, Part IV. Dolichopodidae. 416 pp. Copenhagen
- MACQUART, J. 1827. *Insectes diptères du nord de la France*. Platypézines, Dolichopodes, Empides, Hybotides. 159 pp., Lille
- 1834. *Histoire naturelle des insectes*. Diptères. Tome Premier. 578 pp. and 12 pls., Paris
- MEIGEN, J. W. 1824. *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten* Vol. 4, xii + 428 pp., pls. 33-41, Hamn
- 1838. *Idem*. vol. 7, xii + 434 pp. and pls. 67-74, Hamn
- NEUHAUS, G. H. 1886. *Diptera Marchica*. Systematisches Verzeichniss der Zweiflüger (Mücken und Fliegen) der Mark Brandenburg, mit kurzer Beschreibung und analytischen Bestimmungs-Tabellen. pp. IV + 371, Berlin
- PARENT, O. 1938. *Faune de France*. 35. Diptères Dolichopodidae. 720 pp. Paris
- PERRIS, É. 1849 or 1850. Lettre de M. Edouard Perris a M.^{xxx} sur une excursion dans les grandes landes. *Mem. Acad. Sci. Lyon (Sect. Sci.)* 2 : 433-506

* In proposal (4) *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 30 : 119, the applicants requested that HYDROPHORINAE Lioy, 1864 or Schiner, 1864 be placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology. Further investigation has revealed that Lioy's paper was published a few months earlier than Schiner's.

In *Verh. k.-k. zool. bot. Gesell. Wien* 14 1864 : 61 a meeting of 5th October 1864 is reported with a note saying that Schiner's Catalogue is now available. On p. 44 (*tom. cit.*) at a meeting of 1st June 1864, notice was given that the Catalogue had been printed and that members would be informed when it had been published. Therefore the Catalogue must have been published between 1st June and 5th October 1864, and unless proved to the contrary the date of publication will be considered to be October 1864.

On the other hand Lioy cannot be dated later than 31st July 1864 (*Atti Soc. ital. Sci. nat* 6 1864 : 391), where *Atti dell' I.R. Istituto Veneto ecc.* Serie III Tomo IX Dispensa 4, 5, 6 and 7 are listed among those books received by the Society between June and July 1864. M.A.G.

- STEYSKAL, G. C., ROBINSON, H., ULRICH, H., & HURLEY, R. L. 1973. *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823 (Insecta, Diptera, Dolichopodidae): Request for suppression under the plenary powers of the designation by Macquart, 1827 of *H. jaculus* Fallén as type of the genus in favour of *H. nebulosus* Fallén in order to conserve consistent usage. Z.N.(S.) 2036. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 30 : 118-120
- WAHLBERG, P. F. 1844. Nya Diptera från Norbotten och Luleå Lappmark. *Öfvers. Vetensk.-Akad. Förhandl.* (Stockholm) 1 : 106-110
- WALKER, F. 1848-1849. *List of the Dipterous insects in the British Museum*. Parts I-IV, with index to the four parts. pp. IV + 1172, London
- 1858. *Insecta Saundersiana*. Vol. I. Diptera. 474 pp. and 8 pls., London
- ZETTERSTEDT, J. W. 1840. *Insecta Lapponica*. VI + 1140 cols., Lipsiae
- 1843. *Diptera Scandinaviae*. Vol. 2, pp. 441-894
- 1849. *Idem.*, vol. 8, pp. 2935-3366
- 1852. *Idem.*, vol. 11, pp. I-XII + 4091-4545
- 1855. *Idem.*, vol. 12, pp. I-XX + 4547-4942
- 1859. *Idem.*, vol. 13, pp. I-XVI + 4943-6190

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE SUPPRESSION
OF THE FAMILY-GROUP NAME PLATYCHOEROPIDAE. Z.N.(S.) 2052
(See volume 30, pages 207-209)

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

I would like to point to an error in Dr. Gingerich's application, an error I must say rather often made. On p. 208 the applicant requested the Commission to suppress the family name PLATYCHOEROPIDAE [par. 7(1)], but to place the generic name *Platychoerops* on the Official List of Generic Names [par. 7(4)(b)]. It is impossible for the Commission to suppress a family name when it does not suppress at the same time the name of the genus on which that family is based. As long as *Platychoerops* is an available name it must remain possible to base a family name on it. What name should an author, who considers *Platychoerops* as the only genus in a monotypic family, use for that family if PLATYCHOEROPIDAE is suppressed?

In the present case the applicant should request to place both PLATYCHOEROPIDAE and PLESIADAPIDAE on the Official List with the annotation that zoologists considering that these two names are synonymous should use PLESIADAPIDAE in preference to PLATYCHOEROPIDAE.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED
CONSERVATION OF THE FAMILY-GROUP NAME PLATYSTOMATIDAE
SCHINER, 1862. Z.N.(S.) 2053
(See volume 31, pages 59-61)

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

At the risk of becoming monotonous, I have to point out that a family-group name cannot be suppressed by the Commission as long as the name of its type-genus is still an available name, not a junior homonym.

The Commission therefore cannot suppress the family name ACHIIDAE (as requested by Steyskal and McAlpine in paragraph 4(1) of their application) unless it also suppressed the available name *Achias* Fabricius, 1805.

The proper action to be taken is to place both ACHIIDAE and PLATYSTOMATIDAE on the Official List with the indication that authors who consider the genera *Achias* Fabricius, 1805 and *Platystoma* Meigen, 1803, to belong to one family, should give the family group name PLATYSTOMATIDAE (emendation of PLATYSTOMINAE) Schiner, 1862, preference over ACHIIDAE (emendation of ACHIASIDAE) Fleming, 1821.